	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/457,895	CARONNI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph McArdle	2132	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Joseph McArdle (PTO)._ 　　　(3)_Ranjeev Singh._

(2) _Gilberto Barron (PTO)._ 　　　(4)_____.

　　Date of Interview: _08 September 2004_.

　　Type: a)☐ Telephonic　b)☐ Video Conference
　　　　c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant　2)☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:　d)☐ Yes　e)☒ No.
　　If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _1,5,6,15 and 16_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Agrawal (U.S. Patent No.4825354), Goertzel (U.S. Patent No. 6308273)_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached.　g)☐ was not reached.　h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _See Continuation Sheet_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached.　Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04).　If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note:　You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: With respect to the statutory rejection set forth in claims 15 and 16, It was agreed upon that the use of claim language such as "execution" or "implementation" in describing the relationship between the data structure and the operating system, in particular how the data structure causes an effect on the operating system.

In regards to the proposed amendment of idependant claim 1, it was agreed upon that moving the limitations previously set forth under claim 6, that pertain to the use of a "proc stucture", are sufficient in overcoming the previously set forth rejection. Upon receipt of the amendment an updated art search will be performed..